UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,702	03/30/2004	Jonathan J. Hull	20412-08440	7219
76137 RICOH/FENW	7590 07/02/200 ICK	9	EXAMINER	
SILICON VAL		[	MARANDI, JAMES R	
801 CALIFORI MOUNTAIN V	YIEW, CA 94041		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2421	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/02/2009	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOC@FENWICK.COM gsueoka@fenwick.com nmorad@fenwick.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/814,702	HULL ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JAMES R. MARANDI	2421	

	JAMES N. MARANDI	2421	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 June 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07()	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount chortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS			e appeal. Since a
3. 🛛 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t			cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor		ΓE below);	
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	•	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	<u> </u>		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).			_
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu  See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application ir	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/John W. Miller/	/James R. Marandi/		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2421	Examiner, Art Unit 2421		

## Continuation of 11:

Applicant argues that "Aratani discloses that the action code list is printed by a printer that is externally connected to the apparatus via an IEEE 1394 interface. Thus, Aratani's apparatus does not comprise the necessary elements to print the action code list and instead relies on the external printer to print the action code list". Page 11 of the Remarks, last paragraph through Page 12 of Remarks, 1st paragraph

Examiner disagrees. Applicant's claim language does not specifically indicate how the printer engine (printing mechanics) and the processor of such printer (electronics comprising drivers, processors, etc) are connected. As such Aratani's disclosure, as shown in Fig. 1 (processor 100 and printer engine 202), reads on applicant's claim.

Applicant further argues the combination of Aratani and Hoda. Pages 13 and 14 of Remarks

Examiner reiterates that Aratani's disclosed action codes are numeral codes as shown in Fig. 10. A unique identification code is disclosed by Hoda to be a "barcode"; therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan, at the time of invention, to use Hoda's barcodes, as a unique identifier, instead of the Aratani's numerals...